arXiv:1701.07024v1 [math.CO] 24 Jan 2017

A MAXIMAL BOOLEAN SUBLATTICE THAT IS NOT THE RANGE OF A BANASCHEWSKI FUNCTION

SAMUEL MOKRIŠ AND PAVEL RŮŽIČKA

Dedicated to Jára Cimrman on the occasion of his 50th birthday.

Abstract. We construct a countable bounded sublattice of the lattice of all subspaces of a vector space with two non-isomorphic maximal Boolean sublattice. We represent one of them as the range of a Banschewski function and we prove that this is not the case of the other. Hereby we solve a problem of F. Wehrung.

1. Introduction

In [14] Friedrich Wehrung defined a *Banaschewski function* on a bounded complemented lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ as an antitone (i.e., order-reversing) map sending each element of $\boldsymbol{L}$ to its complement, being motivated by the earlier result of Bernhard Banaschewski that such a function exists on the lattice of all subspaces of a vector space [1]. Wehrung extended Banaschewski's result by proving that every countable complemented modular lattice has a Banaschewski function with a Boolean range and that all the possible ranges of Banaschewski functions on $\boldsymbol{L}$ are isomorphic [14, Corollary 4.8].

Still in [14] Wehrung defined a ring-theoretical analogue of Banaschewski function that, for a von Neuman regular ring R, is closely connected to the lattice-theoretical Banaschewski function on the lattice $\boldsymbol{L}(R)$ of all finitely generated right ideals of R. He made use of these ideas to construct a unit-regular ring S (in fact of bounded index 3) of size $\aleph_1$ with no Banaschewski function [15].

Furthermore in [14] Wehrung defined notions of a Banaschewski measure and a Banaschewski trace on sectionally complemented modular lattices and he proved that a sectionally complemented lattice which is either modular with a large 4-frame or Arguesian with a large 3-frame is coordinatizable (i.e. isomorphic to $\boldsymbol{L}(R)$ for a possibly non-unital von Neumann regular ring R) if and only if it has a Banaschewski trace. Applying this results, he constructed a non-coordinatizable sectionally complemented modular lattice, of size $\aleph_1$, with a large 4-frame [14, Theorem 7.5].

The aim of our paper is to solve the second problem from [14]:

Date: January 26, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06A15, 06C20, 06D75.

Key words and phrases. lattice, complemented, modular, Boolean, Banaschewski function, Schmidt's construction, closure operator, adjunction.

The first author was partially supported by the project SVV-2015-260227 of Charles University in Prague. The second author was partially supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under the grant no. GACR 14-15479S.

Problem (Problem 2 from [14]). *Is every maximal Boolean sublattice of an at most countable complemented modular lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ the range of some Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{L}$? Are any two such Boolean sublattices isomorphic?*

We construct a countable complemented modular lattice $\boldsymbol{S}$ with two non-isomorphic maximal Boolean sublattices $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{E}$. We represent $\boldsymbol{E}$ as the range of a Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$ and we prove that $\boldsymbol{B}$ is not the range of any Banaschewski function. Finally we represent the lattice $\boldsymbol{S}$ as a bounded sublattice of the subspace-lattice of a vector space.

2. Basic concepts

We start with recalling same basic notions as well as the precise definition of the Banaschewski function adopted from [14]. Next we outline the Schmidt's $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ construction, which we then apply to define the bounded modular lattice $\boldsymbol{S}$ containing a pair of non-isomorphic maximal Boolean sublattices.

2.1. **Some standard notions, notation, and the Banaschewski function.** A lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is *bounded* if it has both the least element and the greatest element, denoted by $0_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ and $1_{\boldsymbol{L}}$, respectively. A *bounded sublattice* of a bounded lattice is its sublattice containing the bounds. Given elements a, b, c of a lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ with zero, we will use the notation $c = a \oplus b$ when $a \wedge b = 0_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ and $a \vee b = c$. A *complement* of an element a of a bounded lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is an element a' of $\boldsymbol{L}$ such that $a \oplus a' = 1_{\boldsymbol{L}}$. A lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is said to be *complemented* provided that it is bounded and each element of $\boldsymbol{L}$ has a (not necessarily unique) complement. A lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is *relatively complemented* if each of its interval is complemented. Note that a relatively complemented lattice is not necessarily bounded.

We say that a lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is *uniquely complemented* if it is bounded and each element of $\boldsymbol{L}$ has a unique complement. By a *Boolean lattice* we mean a lattice reduct of a Boolean algebra, that is, a distributive uniquely complemented lattice. For the clarity, let us recall the formal definition of the Banaschewski function [14, Definition 3.1]:

Definition 2.1. Let $\boldsymbol{L}$ be a bounded lattice. A *Banaschewski function* on $\boldsymbol{L}$ is a map $f\colon \boldsymbol{L} \to \boldsymbol{L}$ such that both

(1) $x \leq y$ implies $f(x) \geq f(y)$, for all $x, y \in \boldsymbol{L}$, and
(2) $f(x) \oplus x = 1_{\boldsymbol{L}}$ for all $x \in \boldsymbol{L}$,

hold true.

2.2. **The $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$-construction.** Let $\boldsymbol{L}$ be a lattice. We will call a triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle \in \boldsymbol{L}^3$ *balanced*, if it satisfies

$$a \wedge b = a \wedge c = b \wedge c$$

and we denote by $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ the set of all balanced triples. It is readily seen that $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is a meet-subsemilattice of the cartesian product $\boldsymbol{L}^3$. However, it is not necessarily a join-subsemilattice, for one easily observes that the join of balanced triples may not be balanced. The $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$-construction was introduced by E. T. Schmidt [12, 13] for a bounded distributive lattices $\boldsymbol{L}$. He proved [13, Lemma 1] that in this case $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is a bounded modular lattice and that it is a congruence-preserving extension of the distributive lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$. This result was later extended by Grätzer and Schmidt in various directions [2, 3]. In particular, in [2] they proved

that every lattice with a non-trivial distributive interval has a proper congruence-preserving extension. This was further improved by Grätzer and Wehrung in [7], where they introduced a modification of the $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$-construction, called $\boldsymbol{M}_3\langle\boldsymbol{L}\rangle$-construction. Using this new idea they proved that every non-trivial lattice admits a proper congruence-preserving extension.

The lattice constructions $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ and $\boldsymbol{M}_3\langle\boldsymbol{L}\rangle$ appeared in the series of papers by Grätzer and Wehrung [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] dealing with semilattice tensor product and its related structures, namely the box product and the lattice tensor product [6, Definition 2.1 and definition 3.3]. Indeed, $\boldsymbol{M}_3 \boxtimes \boldsymbol{L} \simeq \boldsymbol{M}_3\langle\boldsymbol{L}\rangle$ for every lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ and $\boldsymbol{M}_3 \otimes \boldsymbol{L} \simeq \boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ whenever $\boldsymbol{L}$ has zero and $\boldsymbol{M}_3 \otimes \boldsymbol{L}$ is a lattice (see [10, Theorem 6.5] and [5, Corollary 6.3]). In particular, the latter is satisfied when the lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is modular with zero. Note also, that if $\boldsymbol{L}$ is a bounded distributive lattice both the constructions $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ and $\boldsymbol{M}_3\langle\boldsymbol{L}\rangle$ coincide. In our paper we get by with this simple case.

Let $\boldsymbol{L}$ be a distributive lattice. Given a triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle \in \boldsymbol{L}^3$, we define

$$\mu\langle a, b, c\rangle = (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c)$$

and we set

$$\overline{\langle a, b, c\rangle} = \langle a \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle, b \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle, c \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle\rangle\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Using the distributivity of $\boldsymbol{L}$ one easily sees that $\overline{\langle a, b, c\rangle}$ is the least balanced triple $\geq \langle a, b, c\rangle$ in $\boldsymbol{L}^3$ and that the map $\overline{\langle -\rangle}\colon \boldsymbol{L}^3 \to \boldsymbol{L}^3$ determines a closure operator on the lattice $\boldsymbol{L}^3$ (see [14, Lemma 2.3] for a refinement of this observation). It is also clear that

$$\begin{aligned} a \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle &= a \vee (b \wedge c),\\ b \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle &= b \vee (a \wedge c),\\ c \vee \mu\langle a, b, c\rangle &= c \vee (a \wedge b). \end{aligned}$$

A triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle \in \boldsymbol{L}^3$ is closed with respect to the closure operator if and only if it is balanced. Therefore the set of all balanced triples, denoted by $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$, forms a lattice [14, Lemma 2.1], where

$$\langle a, b, c\rangle \vee \langle a', b', c'\rangle = \overline{\langle a \vee a', b \vee b', c \vee c'\rangle} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\langle a, b, c\rangle \wedge \langle a', b', c'\rangle = \langle a \wedge a', b \wedge b', c \wedge c'\rangle\,. \tag{2.3}$$

By [5, Lemma 2.9] the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is modular if and only if the lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is distributive. The "if" part of the equivalence is included in the above mentioned [13, Lemma 1].

3. The lattice

Fix an infinite cardinal κ. As it is customary, we identify κ with the set of all ordinals of cardinality less than κ. Let us denote by $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ the Boolean lattice of all subsets of κ and set

$$\mathcal{F}(\kappa) := \{X \subseteq \kappa \mid X \text{ is finite or } \kappa \setminus X \text{ is finite}\}.$$

It is well-known that $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ is a bounded Boolean sublattice of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$. Next, let us define

$$\boldsymbol{T} = \{\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3 \mid C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *The set $\boldsymbol{T}$ forms a bounded join-subsemilattice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3$.*

Proof. Being a lattice polynomial, the map $\mu\colon \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3 \to \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ is monotone. It follows that for all $\langle A, B, C\rangle$, $\langle A', B', C'\rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, the inclusion

$$\mu\langle A \cup A', B \cup B', C \cup C'\rangle \supseteq \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \cup \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle$$

holds, whence also

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(C \cup C'\big) \setminus \mu\langle A \cup A', B \cup B', C \cup C'\rangle\\ \subseteq&\big(C \cup C'\big) \setminus \big(\mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \cup \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle\big)\\ \subseteq&\big(C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle\big) \cup \big(C' \setminus \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle\big).\end{aligned}$$

Thus if both $C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle$ and $C' \setminus \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle$ are finite, then $(C \cup C') \setminus \mu\langle A \cup A', B \cup B', C \cup C'\rangle$ is finite as well. It follows that $\boldsymbol{T}$ is join-subsemilattice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3$. Finally, it is clear that both $0_{\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3} = \langle\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle$ and $1_{\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3} = \langle\kappa, \kappa, \kappa\rangle$ belong to $\boldsymbol{T}$. □

Let $\boldsymbol{S} := \boldsymbol{T} \cap \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$ denote the set of all balanced triples from $\boldsymbol{T}$.

Lemma 3.2. *The join-semilattice $\boldsymbol{T}$ is closed under the $\overline{\langle -\rangle}$ operation.*

Proof. Let $\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{T}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ is a lattice, we have that all $A \cup \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle$, $B \cup \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle$ and $C \cup \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle$ belong to $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$. Since the map $\mu\colon \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3 \to \mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ is monotone, the inclusion $\mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \subseteq \mu\overline{\langle A, B, C\rangle}$ holds. It follows that

$$\big(C \cup \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle\big) \setminus \mu\overline{\langle A, B, C\rangle} \subseteq C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle,$$

which is finite due to $\langle A, B, C\rangle$ being an element of $\boldsymbol{T}$. □

Lemma 3.3. *The set $\boldsymbol{S}$ forms a bounded sublattice of the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$.*

Proof. Applying Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, we deduce that $\boldsymbol{S}$ is a bounded join-subsemilattice of $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$. Therefore, it suffices to verify that $\boldsymbol{S}$ is a meet-subsemilattice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3$. It is easy to observe that if at least one of $\langle A, B, C\rangle, \langle A', B', C'\rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$ is balanced, then

$$\mu\langle A \cap A', B \cap B', C \cap C'\rangle = \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \cap \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle.$$

¿From this we we get that if $\langle A, B, C\rangle, \langle A', B', C'\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(C \cap C'\big) \setminus \mu\langle A \cap A', B \cap B', C \cap C'\rangle\\ =&\big(C \cap C'\big) \setminus \big(\mu\langle A, B, C\rangle \cap \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle\big)\\ \subseteq&\big(C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle\big) \cup \big(C' \setminus \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle\big),\end{aligned}$$

so the set $(C \cap C') \setminus \mu\langle A \cap A'.B \cap B', C \cap C'\rangle$ is finite. This concludes the proof. □

As discussed in Section 2, since the lattice $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ is distributive, the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$ is modular. Observe that the mapping $A \mapsto \langle A, A, A\rangle$ embeds $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ into $\boldsymbol{S}$, from which we deduce that

$$|\mathcal{F}(\kappa)| \leq |\boldsymbol{S}| \leq |\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3|.$$

Since the size of both $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3$ is κ, we get that $|\boldsymbol{S}| = \kappa$. Let us sum up these observations in the following corollary to Lemma 3.3.

Corollary 3.4. *For κ countable infinite, $\boldsymbol{S}$ forms a countable bounded modular lattice.*

Remark 3.5. Note that unlike $\boldsymbol{S}$, the lattice $\boldsymbol{T}$ is not a meet-subsemillatice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)^3$. Indeed, both $\langle\kappa, \emptyset, \kappa\rangle, \langle\emptyset, \kappa, \kappa\rangle \in \boldsymbol{T}$ while $\langle\kappa, \emptyset, \kappa\rangle \wedge \langle\emptyset, \kappa, \kappa\rangle = \langle\emptyset, \emptyset, \kappa\rangle \notin \boldsymbol{T}$.

4. A Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$

In this section we define a Banaschewski function $f\colon \boldsymbol{S} \to \boldsymbol{S}$ and describe, element-wise, its range.

Lemma 4.1. *The map $f\colon \boldsymbol{S} \to \boldsymbol{S}$ defined by*

(4.1)
$$f\langle A, B, C\rangle := \langle \kappa \setminus A, \kappa \setminus (B \cup C), \kappa \setminus (A \cup B \cup C)\rangle\,, \quad \text{for all } \langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S},$$

is a Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$.

Proof. First we prove that $\boldsymbol{S}$ contains the range of the map f. Observe that if we put $A' := \kappa \setminus A$ and $B' := \kappa \setminus (B \cup C)$, then $f\langle A, B, C\rangle = \langle A', B', A' \cap B'\rangle$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ is a Boolean lattice, the sets A', B' and $A' \cap B'$ all belong to $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$. Furthermore, we have that

$$A' \cap B' = \mu\langle A', B', A' \cap B'\rangle = \mu f\langle A, B, C\rangle.$$

In particular, $A' \cap B' \setminus \mu f\langle A, B, C\rangle = \emptyset$, whence $f\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S}$.

It is clear from (4.1) that the map f is antitone. Finally, we check that

$$1_{\boldsymbol{S}} = \langle \kappa, \kappa, \kappa\rangle = \langle A, B, C\rangle \oplus f\langle A, B, C\rangle\,, \quad \text{for all } \langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S}.$$

It follows immediately from the definition of f that

$$\langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge f\langle A, B, C\rangle = \langle \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle = 0_{\boldsymbol{S}}.$$

To prove that $\langle A, B, C\rangle \vee f\langle A, B, C\rangle = 1_{\boldsymbol{S}}$, let us verify that

$$\kappa = \mu\langle A \cup (\kappa \setminus A), B \cup (\kappa \setminus (B \cup C)), C \cup (\kappa \setminus (A \cup B \cup C))\rangle. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that each element of κ that is *not* contained in C belongs to $B \cup (\kappa \setminus (B \cup C))$. Together with $A \cup (\kappa \setminus A) = \kappa$, we get that (4.2) holds, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{E}$ denote the range of the Banaschewski function $f\colon \boldsymbol{S} \to \boldsymbol{S}$. Then*

$$\boldsymbol{E} = \{\langle A, B, A \cap B\rangle \mid A, B \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa)\}$$

and the mapping

$$\langle A, B, A \cap B\rangle \mapsto \langle A, B\rangle \tag{4.3}$$

determines an isomorphism from $\boldsymbol{E}$ onto the Boolean lattice $\mathcal{F}(\kappa) \times \mathcal{F}(\kappa)$.

Proof. While proving Lemma 4.1, we have observed that

$$\boldsymbol{E} \subseteq \{\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S} \mid C = A \cap B\} = \{\langle A', B', A' \cap B'\rangle \mid A', B' \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa)\}. \tag{4.4}$$

A straightforward computation gives that $f(f\langle A', B', A' \cap B'\rangle) = \langle A', B', A' \cap B'\rangle$, so the lattice $\boldsymbol{E}$ is equal to the right-hand side of (4.4). Finally, it is readily seen that the correspondence (4.3) determines an isomorphism $\boldsymbol{E} \to \mathcal{F}(\kappa) \times \mathcal{F}(\kappa)$. □

It was noted in [14] that if the range of a Banaschewski function on a lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ is Boolean, then it is a *maximal* Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{L}$. Thus we derive from Theorem 4.2 that $\boldsymbol{E}$ is a maximal Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{B}$.

5. The counter-example

In the present section, we construct another maximal Boolean sublattice $\boldsymbol{B}$ of the lattice $\boldsymbol{S}$. We show that the lattices $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}$ are not isomorphic and we prove directly that the lattice $\boldsymbol{B}$ is not the range of any Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$.

Lemma 5.1. *The assignment $\langle A, C\rangle \mapsto g\langle A, C\rangle := \langle A, A\cap C, C\rangle$ defines a bounded lattice embedding $g\colon \mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\to \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$. In particular, the range of g is a bounded Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$.*

Proof. It is clear from the definition of the map g that it is injective and that its range is included in $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$. Further, for any $A, A', C, C'\subseteq\kappa$, the equality

$$g\langle A, C\rangle \wedge g\langle A', C'\rangle = g\langle A\cap A', C\cap C'\rangle$$

holds by (2.3), while

$$g\langle A, C\rangle \vee g\langle A', C'\rangle = g\langle A\cup A', C\cup C'\rangle \tag{5.1}$$

can be easily deduced from (2.1) and (2.2). Finally, observe that $g\langle\kappa,\kappa\rangle = \langle\kappa,\kappa,\kappa\rangle$ and $g\langle\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle = \langle\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle$, which concludes the proof. □

For any $A, C\in\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$, we say that $\langle A, C\rangle$ is *finite* if both A and C are finite, and we say that $\langle A, C\rangle$ is *co-finite* if both $\kappa\setminus A$ and $\kappa\setminus C$ are finite. Let us write $A\sim C$ if $\langle A, C\rangle$ is either finite or co-finite. Note that there are pairs $A, C\in\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ such that $\langle A, C\rangle$ is neither finite nor co-finite; namely, $A\sim C$ if and only if the symmetric difference $(A\setminus C)\cup(C\setminus A)$ is finite.

Lemma 5.2. *The set*

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \{\langle A, C\rangle\in\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa) \mid A\sim C\}$$

form a bounded Boolean sublattice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$.

Proof. Let $\langle A, C\rangle$, $\langle A', C'\rangle$ be a pair of elements from $\boldsymbol{A}$. If at least one of them is finite, then $\langle A\cap A', C\cap C'\rangle$ is clearly finite as well. If both $\langle A, C\rangle$ and $\langle A', C'\rangle$ are co-finite, then so is $\langle A\cap A', C\cap C'\rangle$. In either case, $\langle A\cap A', C\cap C'\rangle\in\boldsymbol{A}$.

If at least one of the pairs $\langle A, C\rangle, \langle A', C'\rangle$ is co-finite, then $\langle A\cup A', C\cup C'\rangle$ is co-finite, while if both $\langle A, C\rangle$ and $\langle A', C'\rangle$ are finite, then so is $\langle A\cup A', C\cup C'\rangle$. In particular, $\langle A\cup A', C\cup C'\rangle\in\boldsymbol{A}$ whenever $\langle A, C\rangle, \langle A', C'\rangle\in\boldsymbol{A}$.

We have shown that $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$. To complete the proof, observe that $\langle\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle$ is finite and $\langle\kappa,\kappa\rangle$ is co-finite and that the unique complement in $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ of each $\langle A, C\rangle\in\boldsymbol{A}$, namely $\langle\kappa\setminus A, \kappa\setminus C\rangle$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{A}$. □

Lemma 5.3. *The g-image $\boldsymbol{B} = g(\boldsymbol{A})$ of $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a bounded Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{S}$.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, $\boldsymbol{B}$ is a bounded Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{F}(\kappa)]$. Thus in view of Lemma 3.3, it suffices to verify that $\boldsymbol{B}\subseteq\boldsymbol{S}$, that is, that $C\setminus(A\cap C)$ is finite for every $\langle A, C\rangle\in\boldsymbol{A}$. This is clear when $\langle A, C\rangle$ is finite. If $\langle A, C\rangle$ is co-finite, then $C\setminus(A\cap C) = C\setminus A\subseteq\kappa\setminus A$ is finite and we are done. □

Observe that if $\langle A, B, C\rangle$ is a balanced triple then $B\subseteq A$ if and only if $B = A\cap B = A\cap C$. It follows that

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \{\langle A, B, C\rangle\in\boldsymbol{S} \mid A\sim C \text{ and } B\subseteq A\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{S} \setminus \boldsymbol{B}$ and let $\langle A', B', C'\rangle$ be a complement of $\langle A, B, C\rangle$ in $\boldsymbol{S}$. If $B \subseteq A$, then $B' \not\subseteq A'$.*

Proof. Since $\langle A, B, C\rangle \notin \boldsymbol{B}$ and $B \subseteq A$, it follows from (5.2) that $A \nsim C$. Hence exactly one of the two sets A, C is finite. From $B \subseteq A$ and $C \setminus B$ being finite we conclude that C and $\kappa \setminus A$ are finite. It follows that the set $B = B \cap C$ is finite as well.

Suppose now that $B' \subseteq A'$. Since $\langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge \langle A', B', C'\rangle = 0_{\boldsymbol{S}}$, we have that $A \cap A' = \emptyset$, whence the set $A' \subseteq \kappa \setminus A$ is finite. A fortiori, the set B' is also finite due to the assumption that $B' \subseteq A'$. As $C' \setminus B' = C' \setminus (B' \cap A') = C' \setminus \mu\langle A', B', C'\rangle$ is also finite, we conclude that so is C'. But then

$$\mu\langle A \cup A', B \cup B', C \cup C'\rangle \subseteq B \cup B' \cup C \cup C'$$

is a finite set, which contradicts the assumption that $\langle A, B, C\rangle \vee \langle A', B', C'\rangle = \langle \kappa, \kappa, \kappa\rangle = 1_{\boldsymbol{S}}$. □

Corollary 5.5. *Every complemented bounded sublattice $\boldsymbol{C}$ of $\boldsymbol{S}$ such that $\boldsymbol{B} \subsetneq \boldsymbol{C}$ contains an element $\langle A, B, C\rangle$ with $B \not\subseteq A$.*

Proof. Let $\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{C} \setminus \boldsymbol{B}$ and let $\langle A', B', C'\rangle$ be its complement in $\boldsymbol{C}$. Applying Lemma 5.4, we get that either $B \not\subseteq A$ or $B' \not\subseteq A'$. □

Proposition 5.6. *The lattice $\boldsymbol{B}$ is a maximal Boolean sublattice of $\boldsymbol{S}$.*

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{C}$ be a complemented bounded sublattice of $\boldsymbol{S}$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{B} \subsetneq \boldsymbol{C}$. There is $\langle A, B, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{C}$ with $B \not\subseteq A$ by Corollary 5.5. We can pick a finite nonempty $F \subseteq (B \setminus A)$. Since the triple $\langle A, B, C\rangle$ is balanced,

$$\emptyset = F \cap A = F \cap B \cap A = F \cap B \cap C = F \cap C. \tag{5.3}$$

Now observe that both $g\,\langle F, \emptyset\rangle$ and $g\,\langle \emptyset, F\rangle$ are in $\boldsymbol{B}$. Applying (5.1) and (5.3), we get that

$$\langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge \big(g\,\langle F, \emptyset\rangle \vee g\,\langle \emptyset, F\rangle\big) = \langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge g\,\langle F, F\rangle = \langle \emptyset, F, \emptyset\rangle\,, \tag{5.4}$$

while

$$\big(\langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge g\,\langle F, \emptyset\rangle\big) \vee \big(\langle A, B, C\rangle \wedge g\,\langle \emptyset, F\rangle\big) = \langle \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle\,. \tag{5.5}$$

It follows from (5.4) and (5.5) that the lattice $\boldsymbol{C}$ is not distributive, *a fortiori* it is not Boolean. □

Proposition 5.7. *The sublattice $\boldsymbol{B}$ of $\boldsymbol{S}$ is not the range of any Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$.*

Proof. The range of a Banaschewski function on $\boldsymbol{S}$ must contain a complement of each element of $\boldsymbol{S}$. We show that no complement of $\langle \kappa, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle$ in $\boldsymbol{S}$ belongs to $\boldsymbol{B}$.

Suppose the contrary, that is, that there is $\langle A, B, C\rangle = g\,\langle A, C\rangle \in \boldsymbol{B}$ satisfying $\langle \kappa, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle \oplus \langle A, B, C\rangle = 1_{\boldsymbol{S}}$. Then $A = A \cap \kappa = \emptyset$, and by (5.2) also $B = \emptyset$. Then from $B = \emptyset$ and $\langle \kappa, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle \vee \langle A, B, C\rangle = 1_{\boldsymbol{S}}$, one infers that $C = \kappa$. It follows that $\langle A, B, C\rangle \notin \boldsymbol{S}$; indeed, $C \setminus \mu\langle A, B, C\rangle = C \setminus \emptyset = \kappa$ is not finite. Thus $\langle A, B, C\rangle \notin \boldsymbol{B}$, which is a contradiction. □

Remark 5.8. Note that for the particular case of $\kappa = \aleph_0$, the assertion of Proposition 5.7 follows from Proposition 5.9 together with [14, Corollary 4.8], which states that the ranges of two Boolean Banaschewski functions on a *countable* complemented modular lattice are isomorphic.

Proposition 5.9. *The lattices $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{E}$ are not isomorphic.*

Proof. In $\boldsymbol{B}$, every *finite* element $g\,\langle A, C\rangle$ is a join of a finite set of atoms, namely

$$g\,\langle A, C\rangle = \left(\bigvee_{\alpha\in A} g\,\langle\{\alpha\},\emptyset\rangle\right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{\gamma\in C} g\,\langle\emptyset,\{\gamma\}\rangle\right),$$

and, dually, every co-finite element is a meet of a finite set of co-atoms. On the other hand, there are elements in $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ that are neither finite joins of atoms nor finite meets of co-atoms. Recall that in Lemma 4.2, we have observed that the lattice $\boldsymbol{E}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)\times\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$. Therefore the lattices $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{E}$ are not isomorphic. □

6. Representing $\boldsymbol{S}$ in a subspace-lattice

Although the construction in the three previous sections was performed for an *infinite* cardinal κ, the results of the present section on embedding the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ into $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ (namely Theorem 6.4) work just as well for κ finite. In particular, Proposition 6.5 (an enhancement of [5, Lemma 2.9]) holds for lattices of any cardinality.

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be an arbitrary field and let $\boldsymbol{V}$ denote the vector space over the field $\mathbb{F}$ presented by generators $x_\alpha, y_\alpha, z_\alpha$, $\alpha\in\kappa$, and relations $x_\alpha + y_\alpha + z_\alpha = 0$. For a subset X of the vector space $\boldsymbol{V}$ we denote by $\mathrm{Span}(X)$ the subspace of $\boldsymbol{V}$ generated by X. Given subspaces of $\boldsymbol{V}$, say $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$, we will use the notation $\boldsymbol{X}+\boldsymbol{Y} = \mathrm{Span}(\boldsymbol{X}\cup\boldsymbol{Y})$. Let $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ denote the lattice of all subspaces of the vector space $\boldsymbol{V}$.

For all $A, B, C\subseteq\kappa$ we put $\boldsymbol{X}_A = \mathrm{Span}(\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha\in A\})$, $\boldsymbol{Y}_B = \mathrm{Span}(\{y_\beta \mid \beta\in B\})$, and $\boldsymbol{Z}_C = \mathrm{Span}(\{z_\gamma \mid \gamma\in C\})$.

We define a map $F\colon \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3 \to \mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ by the correspondence

$$\langle A, B, C\rangle \mapsto \boldsymbol{X}_A + \boldsymbol{Y}_B + \boldsymbol{Z}_C. \tag{6.1}$$

Each of the sets $\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha\in\kappa\}$, $\{y_\beta \mid \beta\in\kappa\}$, and $\{z_\gamma \mid \gamma\in\kappa\}$ is clearly linearly independent. It follows that $\boldsymbol{X}_{A\cup A'} = \boldsymbol{X}_A + \boldsymbol{X}_{A'}$ for all $A, A'\subseteq\kappa$ and, similarly, $\boldsymbol{Y}_{B\cup B'} = \boldsymbol{Y}_B + \boldsymbol{Y}_{B'}$ and $\boldsymbol{Z}_{C\cup C'} = \boldsymbol{Z}_C + \boldsymbol{Z}_{C'}$ for all $B, B', C, C'\subseteq\kappa$. A straightforward computation gives the following lemma:

Lemma 6.1. *The map $F\colon \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3 \to \mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ is a bounded join-homomorphism.*

Proof. Clearly $F\,\langle\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle = \boldsymbol{0}$ and $F\,\langle\kappa,\kappa,\kappa\rangle = \boldsymbol{V}$. Following the definitions, we compute $F(\langle A, B, C\rangle) + F(\langle A', B', C'\rangle) = \boldsymbol{X}_A + \boldsymbol{Y}_B + \boldsymbol{Z}_C + \boldsymbol{X}_{A'} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{B'} + \boldsymbol{Z}_{C'} = \boldsymbol{X}_{A\cup A'} + \boldsymbol{Y}_{B\cup B'} + \boldsymbol{Z}_{C\cup C'} = F(\langle A\cup A', B\cup B', C\cup C'\rangle)$. □

Let $G\colon \mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V}) \to \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$ be a map defined by

$$\boldsymbol{W} \mapsto \langle\{\alpha \mid x_\alpha\in\boldsymbol{W}\}, \{\beta \mid y_\beta\in\boldsymbol{W}\}, \{\gamma \mid z_\gamma\in\boldsymbol{W}\}\rangle,$$

for all $\boldsymbol{W}\in\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$.

It is straightforward that G is a bounded meet-homomorphism and that it is the right adjoint of F (i.e., replacing the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ with its dual, the maps F and G form a Galois correspondence [11]). Indeed, one readily sees that

$$F\,\langle A, B, C\rangle \subseteq \boldsymbol{W} \text{ iff } \langle A, B, C\rangle \leq G(\boldsymbol{W}).$$

The maps F and G induce a closure operator GF on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$.

Lemma 6.2. *The composition $GF\colon \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3 \to \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$ is precisely the closure operator $\overline{\langle - \rangle}$ on $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$ defined by* (2.1).

Proof. We shall prove that $GF\langle A,B,C\rangle = \overline{\langle A,B,C\rangle}$ for every $\langle A,B,C\rangle \in \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^3$. By symmetry, it suffices to prove that

$$\{\alpha \in \kappa \mid x_\alpha \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle\} = A \cup (B \cap C).$$

Let $\alpha \in A \cup (B \cap C)$. If $\alpha \in A$, then $x_\alpha \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle$ by the definition (6.1), while if $\alpha \in B \cap C$, then $x_\alpha = -y_\alpha - z_\alpha \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle$ by (6.1) and the defining relations of $\boldsymbol{V}$. It follows that $A \cup (B \cap C) \subseteq \{\alpha \in \kappa \mid x_\alpha \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle\}$.

In order to prove the opposite inclusion, take any $\xi \in \kappa \setminus A$ satisfying $x_\xi \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle$; if there is one, there is nothing to prove. We need to show that then $\xi \in B \cap C$. Certainly

$$x_\xi = \sum_{\alpha\in A} a_\alpha x_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in B} b_\beta y_\beta + \sum_{\gamma\in C} c_\gamma z_\gamma \tag{6.2}$$

for suitable a_α, b_β, and $c_\gamma \in \mathbb{F}$ such that all but finitely many of them are zero. We set $a_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha \notin A$, $b_\beta = 0$ for $\beta \notin B$, and $c_\gamma = 0$ for $\gamma \notin C$. Since $z_\gamma + x_\gamma + y_\gamma = 0$ for every $\gamma \in \kappa$, it follows from (6.2) that

$$x_\xi = \left(\sum_{\alpha\in A} a_\alpha x_\alpha - \sum_{\gamma\in C} c_\gamma x_\gamma\right) + \left(\sum_{\beta\in B} b_\beta y_\beta - \sum_{\gamma\in C} c_\gamma y_\gamma\right). \tag{6.3}$$

It easily follows from the defining relations of $\boldsymbol{V}$ that $\{x_\alpha, y_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \kappa\}$ forms a basis of $\boldsymbol{V}$. Thus, applying (6.3) we get that

$$a_\xi - c_\xi = 1 \text{ and } b_\xi - c_\xi = 0. \tag{6.4}$$

Since by our assumption $\xi \notin A$, we get from (6.2) that $a_\xi = 0$. Substituting to (6.4) we get that $b_\xi = c_\xi = -1$, hence $\xi \in B \cap C$. This concludes the proof that $A \cup (B \cap C) \supseteq \{\,\alpha \in \kappa \mid x_\alpha \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle\,\}$. □

The next lemma shows that $F \restriction \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ preserves meets. Note that with Lemma 6.1, this means that $F \restriction \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ is a lattice embedding of $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ into the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\langle A,B,C\rangle, \langle A',B',C'\rangle \in \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ be balanced triples. Then*

$$F\langle A,B,C\rangle \cap F\langle A',B',C'\rangle = F\langle A\cap A', B\cap B', C\cap C'\rangle.$$

Proof. Since, by Lemma 6.1, F is a join-homomorphism, it is monotone, whence $F\langle A\cap A', B\cap B', C\cap C'\rangle \subseteq F\langle A,B,C\rangle \cap F\langle A',B',C'\rangle$. Thus it remains to prove the opposite inclusion.

Let $v \in F\langle A,B,C\rangle \cap F\langle A',B',C'\rangle$ be a non-zero vector. Then v can be expressed as

$$v = \sum_{\alpha\in A} a_\alpha x_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in B} b_\beta y_\beta + \sum_{\gamma\in C} c_\gamma z_\gamma = \sum_{\alpha\in A'} a'_\alpha x_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in B'} b'_\beta y_\beta + \sum_{\gamma\in C'} c'_\gamma z_\gamma. \tag{6.5}$$

Consider such an expression of v with

$$|\{\alpha \mid a_\alpha \neq 0\}| + |\{\beta \mid b_\beta \neq 0\}| + |\{\gamma \mid c_\gamma \neq 0\}| \tag{6.6}$$

minimal possible. Put $a_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha \notin A$, $b_\beta = 0$ for $\beta \notin B$, and $c_\gamma = 0$ for $\gamma \notin C$. By symmetry, we can assume that $a_\alpha \neq 0$ for some $\alpha \in A$. Suppose for a contradiction that $\alpha \notin A'$. Since the triple $\langle A',B',C'\rangle$ is balanced, $B' \cap C' \subseteq A'$,

whence $\alpha \notin B' \cap C'$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\alpha \notin B'$. If all a_α, b_α, and c_α were non-zero, we could replace $c_\alpha z_\alpha$ with $-c_\alpha x_\alpha - c_\alpha y_\alpha$ and reduce the value of the expression in (6.6) which is assumed minimal possible. Thus either $b_\alpha = 0$ or $c_\alpha = 0$ (recall that we assume that $a_\alpha \neq 0$). We will deal with these two cases separately. If $b_\alpha = 0$, then the equality

$$a_\alpha x_\alpha + c_\alpha z_\alpha = c'_\alpha z_\alpha \tag{6.7}$$

must hold true. Since x_α and z_α are linearly independent, it follows from (6.7) that $a_\alpha = 0$ which contradicts our choice of α. The remaining case is when $c_\alpha = 0$. Under this assumption we have that

$$a_\alpha x_\alpha + b_\alpha y_\alpha = c'_\alpha z_\alpha.$$

It follows that

$$a_\alpha x_\alpha = c'_\alpha z_\alpha - b_\alpha y_\alpha = -c'_\alpha x_\alpha - (c'_\alpha + b_\alpha) y_\alpha. \tag{6.8}$$

Since x_α and y_α are linearly independent, we infer from (6.8) that $a_\alpha = -c'_\alpha = b_\alpha$. Then we could reduce the value of (6.6) by replacing $a_\alpha x_\alpha + b_\alpha y_\alpha$ with $c'_\alpha z_\alpha$ in (6.5). This contradicts the minimality of (6.6). □

Combining Lemma 6.1, Lemma 6.2, and Lemma 6.3, we conclude:

Theorem 6.4. *The restrictions $F \restriction \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]\colon \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)] \to \mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ and,* a fortiory*, $F \restriction \boldsymbol{S}\colon \boldsymbol{S} \to \mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ are bounded lattice embeddings. In particular, the lattice $\boldsymbol{S}$ is isomorphic to a bounded sublattice of the subspace-lattice of a vector space.*

It is well-known that a distributive lattice $\boldsymbol{L}$ embeds (via a bounds-preserving lattice embedding) into the lattice $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$, where κ is the cardinality of the set of all maximal ideals of $\boldsymbol{L}$. Such embedding induces an embedding $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}] \hookrightarrow \boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ (cf. Lemma 3.3). By Theorem 6.4, the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ embeds into the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ for a suitable vector space $\boldsymbol{V}$ (note again that we now also admit finite κ). Since the lattice $\mathrm{Sub}(\boldsymbol{V})$ is Arguesian, so are $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\mathcal{P}(\kappa)]$ and $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$.

On the other hand, [5, Lemma 2.9] states that a lattice L is distributive if and only if $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is modular. Hence, if $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is modular, it follows that $\boldsymbol{L}$ is distributive, and, by the above argument, $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is even Arguesian. We have thus proven the following strengthening of [5, Lemma 2.9]:

Proposition 6.5. *Let L be a lattice. Then L is distributive iff the lattice $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is modular iff $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ is Arguesian. If this is the case, then $\boldsymbol{M}_3[\boldsymbol{L}]$ can be embedded into the lattice of all subspaces of a suitable vector space over any given field.*

References

1. B. Banaschewski, *Totalgeordnete moduln*, Arch. Math. **7** (1957), 430–440.
2. G. Grätzer and E. T. Schmidt, *A lattice construction and congruence-preserving extensions*, Acta Math. Hungar. **66** (1995), 275–288.
3. ———, *On the independence theorem of related structures for modular (arguesian) lattices*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. **40** (2003), 1–12.
4. G. Grätzer and F. Wehrung, *Flat semilattices*, Colloq. Math. **79** (1999), 185–191.
5. ———, *The $M_3[D]$ construction and n-modularity*, Algebra Universalis **41** (1999), 87–114.
6. ———, *A new lattice construction: the box product*, J. Algebra **221** (1999), 5893–5919.
7. ———, *Proper congruence-preserving extension of lattices*, Acta Math. Hungar. **85** (1999), 169–179.
8. ———, *Tensor product and transferability of semilattices*, Canad. J. Math. **51** (1999), 792–815.

9. ———, *Tensor product and semilattices with zero, revisited*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **147** (2000), 273–301.
10. ———, *A survey of tensor product and related structures in two lectures*, Algebra Universalis **45** (2001), 117–143.
11. Ø. Ore, *Galois Connexions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **55** (1944), 493–513.
12. E. T. Schmidt, *Zur charakterisierung der kongruenzverbände der verbände*, Mat. Časopis Sloven. Akad. Vied. **18** (1968), 3–20.
13. ———, *Every finite distributive lattice is the congruence lattice of a modular lattice*, Algebra Universalis **4** (1974), 49–57.
14. F. Wehrung, *Coordinatization of lattices by regular rings without unit and Banaschewski functions*, Algebra Universalis **64** (2010), 49–67.
15. ———, *A non-coordinatizable sectionally complemented modular lattice with a large Jónsson four-frame*, Adv. in Appl. Math. **47** (2011), 173–193.

Department of Algebra, Faculty of mathematics and Physics, Charles University in Prague, Sokolovská 83, 186 75, Prague, Czech republic

E-mail address, S. Mokriš: smokris@seznam.cz

E-mail address, P. Růžička: ruzicka@karlin.mff.cuni.cz